

ings to indicate the changes relative to the immediate prior version.

The applicant requests an entry and consideration of the amended claims submitted herewith.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kim Kwee Ng/
Kim Kwee Ng

Date: 07 /03/2007
10 Malibu Ln
Centereach, NY 11720-3042
Tel. (631) 632 - 8189
Fax. (631) 632 - 8101

Discussion and Remarks

The applicant appreciates very much the Examiner's Office Action of 4/6/07 for the issuance of allowance for the Claims 60, 63-67, 69-71, 73, 80, 82-85, 87 and 88. The claims 62, 81 and 86 are still withdrawn from consideration. The Examiner states that Claims 62, 81 and 86 are directed to the enclosure being a wall enclosure, which is not properly dependent to include all the limitations of the independent claim, as the independent claim requires the enclosure being comprised of a set of deflectable strips.

The wall enclosure, as stated in Claims 62, 81 and 86, is functionally equivalent to the non-penetrable interlinked flexible strips used in the allowed independent claims 60 and 71.

The use of the wall enclosure has been disclosed in the specification. It is conceivable that someone could use the wall enclosure which is not currently covered by the allowed claims to circumvent the permitted scope of the allowed claims.

In the instant application, various forms of the impenetrable enclosures have been demonstrated. The first impenetrable enclosure is an enclosure comprising a plurality of interlinked flexible strips as shown in Fig. 1. The second example is the deployment of a wall enclosure which comprises a plurality of walls as shown in Fig. 4.

The applicant believes that different types of enclosures to prevent the insect from penetrating have been illustrated in the specification. The wall enclosure and the non-penetrable interlinked flexible strips are functionally equivalent in preventing the insect from penetration. They are both used to cooperate with a crawl path to form an enclosed hallway in which an insect could crawl.

The previously presented claims were not written properly to include the wall enclosure as dependent claims to the allowed independent claims. The following amended claims are proposed to properly place the wall enclosure as a dependent species in the

claims.

The specification appended below is amended to more clearly specify the structure of the applicant's device. The applicant's device is intended to trap houseflies, especially the mosquitoes in the house. These can be illustrated clearly in Fig. 6 where a fly would fly upwardly and pushes the deflectable strips away to enter the chamber. Other prior art devices may have limited coverage over the mosquitoes. The main goal is to have an inexpensive, easily configurable and simple device. The device is easy to maintain for use to trap an un-suspecting fly. The fly would enter the trap in a naturally way, without making any apparent effort to squeeze into the trap.

Proposed amended independent Claims 60 and 71 employ a bottomless enclosure in cooperation with a crawl path to forbid the penetration by an insect in the chamber.

Claims 62 and 81, which are withdrawn from consideration, are directed to a functionally equivalent species as shown in Fig. 4. Claims 62 and 81 employ a wall enclosure comprising a plurality of walls to prevent penetration by the insect.

Proposed new dependent Claims 89 and 90, which are respectively dependent on the amended Claims 60 and 71, comprise a second set of the deflectable strips interlinked by a plurality of short strips.

Claims 66 and 83 are currently amended to be the dependent claims of Claims 89 and 90 respectively.

The applicant requests the cancellation of Claims 86 and 88, and the entry of the amended claims submitted herewith.